DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 818 FL 024 488

AUTHOR Dogancay-Aktuna, Seran; Kamisli, Sibel
TITLE Pragmatic Transfer in Interlanguage Development: A Case Study of Advanced EFL Learners.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 19p.; Paper to be presented at the National Linguistics Conference (11th, Ankara, Turkey, May 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Graduates; College Students; Cross Cultural Studies; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Interference (Language); *Interlanguage; Language Patterns; Language Research; Language Variation; Linguistic Theory; Native Speakers; North American English; *Pragmatics; Role Playing; Second Language Learning; *Semantics; Speech Acts; *Transfer of Training; *Turkish; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

A study examined pragmatic variation across Turkish and American English in the speech act of chastisement, to determine occurrence of pragmatic transfer in the interlanguage of native Turkish speakers learning English as a Second Language (ESL). Data were collected from 80 native speakers of Turkish, 14 native speakers of American English, and 68 advanced Turkish EFL learners in situated role plays, in which individuals responded to wrongdoing of a status-unequal interlocutor in the workplace. Data were analyzed for type and frequency of semantic formulas used by the three groups in the same speech act. Native speaker data were used as a baseline for cross-cultural comparison and for detecting instances of positive and negative transfer. Results indicate both similarities and differences in the groups in choice of strategies for dealing with the same speech act. Similarities in strategy choice were found to be related to positive pragmatic transfer in the target language performance of the ESL students, although negative transfer (interference) occurred in some instances. It is concluded that the advanced ESL learners could diverge significantly from target language norms, indicating lack of sociolinguistic competence in that language and suggesting that sociolinguistic competence is not necessarily acquired alongside grammatical knowledge. Contains 39 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Pragmatic transfer in interlanguage development:

A case study of advanced EFL Learners

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Doğançay-Aktuna
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Seran Doğançay-Aktuna & Sibel Kamışlı

Bogaziçi University

Istanbul, Turkey

ED 408 818

This study examines pragmatic variation across Turkish and American English in the speech act of chastisement, towards analyzing whether and where cases of pragmatic transfer occur in the interlanguage of advanced level EFL learners whose L1 is Turkish. Data was collected from 80 native speakers of Turkish, 14 native speakers of American English and 68 advanced Turkish EFL speakers via situated written role plays where people responded to the wrongdoing of a status unequal interlocutor at the workplace. Data analysis involved revealing the type and frequency of semantic formulas used by the three groups on the same speech act. Native speaker data was then used as baseline for cross-cultural comparison and for detecting cases of positive and negative transfer, as defined by Kasper (1992).

Findings indicate similarities as well as differences across Americans and Turks in their choice of strategies for dealing with the same speech act in interacting with a status unequal person. While similarities were found to lead to positive pragmatic transfer in the target language performance of Turkish EFL learners, sociolinguistic relativity appeared to lead to negative transfer (interference) in some instances, though not in others. Results showed that EFL learners also developed an interlanguage of speech act use, at least so far as chastisement was concerned.

Findings in general indicate that those students categorized as 'advanced' level learners, usually following grammar-oriented proficiency and placement exams, can diverge greatly from target language norms, hence lacking in appropriacy, thus sociolinguistic competence in the target language. This in turn suggests that aspects of sociolinguistic competence are not acquired alongside the grammatical features of the TL in EFL situations, thus these might need to be another focus of instruction.

FL024455

Interlanguage pragmatics

With the advent of the concept of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) and the discussion of its components (Canale & Swain, 1980), the linguistic-dominated focus of interlanguage studies, that was prominent up until the late 1970s, was expanded to cover research on sociolinguistics and discourse aspects of language acquisition, thus leading to the development of a new field called interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). This new area of investigation developed as "the branch of second language acquisition research which studies how non-native speakers (NNS) understand and carry out linguistic

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

action in the target language, and how they acquire second language pragmatic knowledge" (Kasper. 1992:203).

Accordingly, studies in interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) would focus on pragmatic issues such as skills of conversational management and support, as exemplified by turn-taking and backchannel mechanisms, address terms, politeness markers as well as non-verbal communication patterns besides presuppositions, reference, and deixis (Ibid.). Yet, the complexity and the difficulty in detecting, defining, and accounting for the above mentioned features in learner language have rendered studies of interlanguage pragmatics quite difficult. Consequently, this led to ILP research to focus on language learners' production of speech acts, as the most easily identifiable unit of analysis as well as being a central concern of pragmatics. Reports in volumes by Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993, and reviews by Ellis, 1994; Kasper and Dahl, 1991; Wolfson, 1989 provide an excellent view of the scope of research in ILP, though there is an acute need for more studies covering a wider range of first languages and different aspects of pragmatics.

Research in ILP have revealed two important issues relating to second/foreign language acquisition. Firstly, besides linguistic transfer of first language (L1) rules, learners often transfer the sociolinguistic norms of their mother tongues to the target language (TL) via "the use of rules of speaking from one's native speech community when interacting with members of the host speech community or simply when speaking or writing in a second language" (Wolfson, 1989:141), which leads to 'pragmatic interference' (Coulmas, 1978). Secondly, even fairly advanced learners make pragmatic errors such that they fail to convey or understand the intended message because of lack of awareness of pragmatic rules governing the TL or due to the lack of linguistic proficiency to convey the necessary act. For instance, Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) show that even advanced learners had problems in using requests and apologies in socially appropriate ways, while Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) present cases of pragmalinguistic failure in the expression of gratitude by learners of English as a second language. These findings show that pragmatic knowledge does not develop alongside linguistic competence in most cases, which is hardly surprising given the usage-oriented nature of most foreign language instruction.

In attempting to account for the reasons underlying pragmatic transfer several proposals have been made, namely, learners' lack of linguistic proficiency, their perception of speech act use as governed by universal (vs. language-specific) factors, or their perception of similarities between their native culture and that of the target language one, and the psycholinguistic processes of overgeneralization, simplification or reduction of new sociolinguistic knowledge. Yet, research findings up to date provide conflicting results about the causes of pragmatic transfer. For instance, while some researchers (Cohen, 1981; Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein, 1986; Koike, 1989) argue that lack of TL proficiency leads to pragmatic transfer, others report no effects of proficiency on the development of pragmatic competence (Erçetin, 1996; Linell et al. 1992; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987; Trosborg, 1987).

Studies by Kasper (1979 a, b, c, 1981, 1982) and Blum-Kulka (1982, 1983) also support the latter point hence leading them to conclude that "even fairly advanced language learners' communicative acts regularly contain pragmatic errors, or deficits, in that they fail to convey or comprehend the intended illocutionary force or politeness value." (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989: 10)

Failure to learn what is appropriate to say in a particular situation and how to say it is likely to lead to communication problems. 'Communication breakdowns' can occur, when the speaker's intention is not understood by the addressee, while 'communication conflicts' can arise when such a misunderstanding can lead to actual friction between interlocutors (Clyne, 1977, 1979, 1982). Communication conflicts are most likely to occur where the misused language function threatens the dignity of the individual on issues of power, trust, and solidarity (Ibid.).

In a similar vein, misunderstanding of the illocutionary force of an utterance leads to 'pragmalinguistic failure', while making incorrect social judgments about the appropriate and thus expected behavior in a given context results in 'sociopragmatic failure' (Thomas; 1983). Pragmalinguistic failure stems from lack of familiarity with the "linguistic resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions" (Leech, 1983:11) (i.e., not knowing how a given speech act is realized linguistically in a given context). Sociopragmatic failure, on the other hand, involves lack of awareness of the conventions and the sociocultural norms of the target language, such as not knowing the appropriate registers and topics or taboos governing the target language community (i.e., not knowing when it is appropriate to perform a speech act). Defined as above, sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic awareness can be placed in the domain of sociolinguistic competence as is pointed out by Canale (1983).

Concern for reasons of pragmatic transfer has also led some researchers to investigate the effect of formal instruction on the social rules of language use i.e., whether classroom instruction can assist learners achieve native-like utterances in speech act use, thus impeding pragmatic transfer. Existing studies (Atay, 1996; Billymer, 1990; Cohen & Tarone, 1994; Olshtain & Cohen, 1990) pointed out the positive impact of instruction on the acquisition of the social rules of language i.e., formal instruction can increase learners' awarenss of appropriate TL behavior, teach them what is appropriate to say and how to say in a particular situation, thus decreasing the possibilities of pragmatic transfer.

In short, whatever the underlying psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic reasons might be and whether formal instruction can lessen it, pragmatic transfer--both sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic types--seems to be an integral part of second language acquisition thus warrants more empirical research in more languages that those currently available. Such studies will not only aid in getting insights on the development of pragmatics, but the baseline data on contrastive pragmatics can also help language teachers, both native and non-native speakers of the target language, in dealing with the everyday problems they encounter in their teaching. To fulfill these aims, this study looks at pragmatic transfer displayed by native speakers of Turkish who are categorized as 'advanced level' users of English as a Foreign

Language (EFL) from the perspective of their pragmatic behavior in two situations that describe the making of an error, hence calling for possible chastisement, therefore contributing to interlanguage pragmatics from a first language not studied in this respect thus far, to the best of our knowledge.

Subjects

Baseline data was collected from 80 native speakers of Turkish (NSsTr.) and 14 native speakers of American English (NSsAmEng.). All native speaker subjects were university graduates within the age range of 22-36, thus coming from comparable groups. Interlanguage data were obtained from 68 Turkish EFL learners who were all in the first year of a four-year degree program in two large English medium universities in Turkey. The EFL learner group consisted of both males and females in the ages of 18-19. They had either completed the preparatory language courses over one or two semesters or had passed the proficiency exam upon entering the university. Their English language proficiency was said to be the equivalent of a TOEFL score of 500 and above, as attested by their preparatory school grades. This score places our learners in the 'advanced' category by definitions of Turkish high-schools and universities.

Our knowledge of the EFL curricula, supplemented by informal discussions with the learners, ascertained that these students have been learning English in teacher- and grammar-dominated classrooms where there was little or no exposure to sociolinguistic information. A background survey showed that subjects did not spend longer than a vacation period in English speaking countries and their exposure to the English culture outside of the classroom was limited to watching films (usually dubbed or subtitled in Turkish) and listening to popular music in English. In short, the learner group represented ubiquitous examples of EFL learners who learned the TL through explicit instruction with focus on the linguistic aspects of the language, with very limited exposure to it in real communication.

Data collection

Following the tradition in research on pragmatic transfer and speech act use (e.g., Beebe & Takahashi, 1989; Erçetin, 1996; Takahashi & Beebe, 1993), and in order to collect data in a controlled manner, data was collected from the two native speaker groups and from the EFL learners via discourse completion tests that consisted of a written role-plays where respondents were asked to write what they would say in a given situation. Though discourse completion tests (DCTs) are more conducive for revealing the norms of the subjects rather than their actual sociolinguistic behavior (see Beebe & Cummings, 1985; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; Wolfson et al. 1989), in this EFL context they were the most appropriate tools for data collection. Moreover, they enabled us to elicit controlled data as we were interested in a particular speech act i.e. chastisement as performed in different social positions.

Chastisements can threaten the solidarity, trust and power relationships of the interlocutors, thus they are potential cases for communication conflicts, in Clyne's terms. Chastising an interlocutor is a face-threatening act for both parties involved; the speaker places both his/her own and the hearer's dignity into stake by verbally reacting to a wrongdoing and thus runs the risk of losing solidarity with the hearer whose positive face (i.e. need to be liked by others, cf. Brown and Levinson, 1987) is challenged.

All subjects responded to two situations of chastisement taking place between status unequal interlocutors and describing certain wrongdoing within the body of a larger project on speech act use (see Appendix A). These situations were adopted from Beebe and Takahashi (1989) because they were already tested across speech communities, namely, American and Japanese, therefore proved their validity in being situations which were not specific to a particular culture. Furthermore, they provided baseline for further cross-cultural comparisons. The situations were translated into Turkish by the researchers and an independent balanced bilingual, which were then validated by two professors of comparative linguistics in Turkish and English.

Data analysis

The bulk of empirical research in ILP focus on language learners' *production* of speech acts in the TL rather than their *acquisition* of pragmatic features. Much research in this field utilize the research approach of cross-cultural pragmatics by studying how what is seen to be the same speech act is executed across cultures. To reveal cases of pragmatic transfer in learners' behavior in the TL, interlanguage productions are compared with native speakers of the L1 and native speakers of the TL to find out the cases and the extent of pragmatic transfer (cf. Kasper & Dahl, 1991).

Following the above mentioned research trend in ILP, this study first focused on how native speakers of Turkish (NSsTr.) and native speakers of American English (NSsAm. Eng.) perform the same speech act i.e., chastisement studied to obtain a cross-cultural baseline for analyzing interlanguage data. During this process of cross-cultural comparison, sociolinguistic variation in language use are also revealed and such baseline data on the norms of speaking governing different languages can be especially insightful for language teachers who are not native speakers or balanced bilinguals in their students' first language, for the successful detection and remedy of pragmatic transfer. The main focus of the study was investigating whether, where and how pragmatic transfer occurs in the productions of advanced level Turkish EFL learners.

Variation between Turkish and American English in the native speakers' execution of chastisements was investigated in terms of the content and frequency of the semantic formulas they used. Against this baseline the interlanguage productions of EFL learners in executing the same speech act in the same situations were examined to find out the extent to which learners' performance of chastisement differed from NS performance in the TL and whether these

differences were traceable to transfer from L1. Furthermore, Kasper (1992)'s framework was used to classify cases of pragmatic transfer. Accordingly, lack of statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature in L1, TL and IL (interlanguage) was operationalised as positive transfer. Statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature between IL and TL and L1 and TL and lack of statistically significant differences between IL and L1 were taken to indicate cases of negative transfer from the L1. Cases where there were no similarities either between L1 or TL were analyzed as unique cases i.e., accepted as signs of interlanguage development.

To test whether the variation across the three groups was statistically significant, the test for independent population proportions was used where p was set at .05. Z values of 1.645 and above given on Tables 1 and 2 indicate statistically significant differences in the language use of the three groups.

Pragmatic variation in chastising a status unequal: Turks vs. Americans

In this section, a brief comparison of the pragmatic tendencies of native speakers of Turkish and American English, as shown by the comparison of the frequency counts of semantic formulas used by the two native speaker groups in the first, second and fourth columns of Table 1 and 2, will be discussed.

The analysis of the native speaker data revealed similarities and differences between Turkish and English in their reaction to the error of a status unequal interlocutor. Turks used a wider range of semantic formulas to give chastisement and there were certain differences in their language behavior to Americans in the same situations. In general, the most frequently used semantic formula by NSs of Turkish and American English in a higher status role was requesting repair from the lower status person for the mistake made, though this formula was used significantly more by Americans (92.86% vs. 46.27%, Z=3.18, p<.01).

Table 1: Frequency counts of semantic formulas in chastisement: from higher to lower status

	TrNS n=80		AmNS n=14		EFL n=68		TrNS vs. AmNS	EFL vs. Am.NS	EFL vs. Tr.NS
Semantic strategy	n	%	n	%	n	%	Z	Z	Z
Asking for repair	31	46.27	13	92.86	29	46.77	**3.18	**3.13	0.06
Statement of despair	21	31.34	1	7.14	16	25.81	*1.85	1.51	0.69
Statement of error	21	31.34	10	71.43	17	27.42	**2.81	**3.11	0.49
Criticism	11	16.42	1	7.14	7	11.29	0.89	0.46	0.84
Advice	11	16.42	0	0.00	14	22.58	1.63	*1.97	0.88
Warning	10	14.93	0	0.00	12	19.35	1.54	*1.79	0.67
Correction	7	10.45	6	42.86	0	0.00	**3.00	***5.37	**2.62
Asking for suggestion	5	7.46	0	0.00	1	1.61	1.06	0.48	1.58
Sarcasm	5	7.46	0	0.00	4	6.45	1.06	0.97	0.23
Opt out	1	1.49	0	0	13	19.12			
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1.61		0	1.04
Disqualified	13	16.25	0	0	6	8.82			

Notes to the table:

1. Z values above indicate statistically significant differences between the groups compared
2. *: indicates significance level at 0.05
   **: indicates significance level at 0.01
   ***: indicates significance level at 0.001

So far as the internal makeup of the semantic strategies were concerned, it was found that asking for repair appeared in two different syntax categories: order and request. In the Turkish data, 19 out of 30 requests for repair occurred as orders. The tone of order for repair was harsh, almost described as rude ("Sen hemen git diğerlerini çektir./Go and get the others Xeroxed immediately" or "Git hemen gerekli olanlari fotokopi çektir./Go and get the correct ones Xeroxed."). Eleven out of 30 appeared as statements ("Lütfen bana gerekli evrakları en kısa sürede hallet./Please bring the necessary documents in the shortest possible time.") and the rest were in question format (Doğru evrakların fotokopisini çektirebilir misin?/Can you get the right ones xeoroxed?) Contrary to Turks, Americans chose to request for repair (9) rather than order for repair (4). When requesting for repair, one response appeared as a question ("Could you go and make copies off ... while I speak to the press?") while the others were statements

("Please get the duplicating rush the order" or "You'd better get this done so we can hand it out during the conference.")

Another difference between the Turks and the Americans in the repair category was that the Turks in the higher status wanted the lower status to remedy the action by himself or herself as if to punish him or her for doing the wrong thing. The Americans in the higher status, on the other hand, asked the lower status to go and get somebody to remedy the mistake ("Please find someone to help you and use a second or a third copy machine and copy the correct material quickly./I'll start talking and you get some help and get the stuff here as soon as possible.) For them, it sounded as if to accomplish the task was more important than the fact that it happened. Americans appeared more tolerant of the wrongdoing whereas Turks seemed to be less tolerant and more concerned that the mistake was made.

The difference in verbal behavior between Turks and Americans was further supported by Turks' use of formulas such as criticism. The Turkish subjects (16%) criticized the lower status interlocutor almost twice more than the Americans (7%) and sometimes quite harshly ("Allah kahretsin! Sen hiç bir işi başaramazsın./Damn it! You do everything wrong. or "Ne yaptın! Hiç bir işi doğru yapamazsın. See what you did! You never do anything right."). The Americans response did not sound rude and also criticism was direct to a mistake done at the present, not to generalized for all performance of the status unequal or the status unequals overall performance was not judged because of the mistake at hand ("What am I supposed to do now? I'm very disappointed in you.")

The next most frequently applied category by both groups was statement of error although this was more used by the Americans (71%) than the Turks (31%). While Americans tended to state the error and offer a corrective statement such as "These are the wrong papers. I wanted copies of the first 20 pages, not the last 20". Instead of offering a correction, Turks preferred to state the error and show their despair in face of the mistake of the lower status person. They also criticized or offered advice to the lower status person; formulas not preferred by the Americans at all. The Americans were more willing to say what was wrong with the interlocutor's work ("These aren't the right materials.") than the Turks ("Bunlar yanlış evrakların fotokopisi./These are the photocopies of the wrong documents.). American statement of errors led to corrections e.g., "You did X. I needed why." Americans indication of errors were often followed by correction, contrary to Turks' use of statements of despair which suggests that accomplishing a task is more important than why the task fell short. In short Americans seemed to be more task-oriented.

The Turkish native speakers used four additional semantic formulas, namely statement of despair (31%), criticism (11%), advice (11%), and warning (10%), that were not found in the American data. Statements of despair appeared as hypothetical or rhetorical statements or questions to express their despair. ("Allahım, şimdi ne yapacağız? Oh my God, what will we do now? or Aman Tanrım! Nasıl bana böyle bir şey yapabilirsin!? Oh my God! How can you do this to me? What will I do now?). They sounded as if there were no hope to remedy the

situation. Thus the interlocutor lost his or her face and furthermore this failure would lead to severe punishment such as "Kovuldun./ You are fired." or "Ne yaptığını sanıyorsun? Maaşından keseceğim. Eve git ve dinlen./What do you think you have done? I'll cut down on your salary. Go home and rest."

Higher status Turk also gave advice for future improvements/avoidance of the same mistake: (Başarılı olmak istiyorsan daha dikkatli olmalısın bundan böyle. From now on, you should be more careful or Dikkatli ol./Be careful). If his or her advice is not taken seriously i.e., if things are not done in the way he or she asked, these will be serious implications. ("Ya işini doğru yaparsın ya da gidersin./Either you take your job seriously or you leave or "Sana bir daha böyle hata yapmamanı tavsiye ediyorum. Aksi taktirde başına is açarsın./I advise you not to do it again otherwise it can cause you trouble.)

In sum, there were certain differences and certain similarities between the way Turks and the Americans execute a speech act where they show their strong verbal disapproval of an act i.e., xeroxing a wrong document and criticize person of a lower status. The differences lie in the range of the semantic formulas used and their frequency as well as their internal makeup. Similarities were found in terms of some semantic categories commonly employed and among those, the most and the least used categories being the same.

Table 2: Frequency counts of semantic formulas in chastisements: from lower to higher status

	TrNS n=80		AmNS n=14		EFL n=67		EFL vs. AmNS	EFL vs. TrNS	TrNS vs. AmNS
Semantic strategy	n	%	n	%	n	%	Z	Z	Z
Apology	34	50.75	7	50.00	35	63.64	*2.32	*1.68	0.05
Self-defense	32	47.76	8	57.14	24	43.64	0.79	0.27	0.64
Offer of repair	18	26.87	11	78.57	24	43.64	*2.22	*2.10	**3.67
Criticism	10	14.93	0	0.00	7	12.73	1.44	0.27	1.54
Reassurance	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	7.27	1.06	*2.29	0.00
Other	1	1.49	0	0	1	1.82	0.52	0.30	0.42
Opt out	0	0	0	0	14	25.45	0.00	1.13	0.00
Disqualified	13	16.25	0	0	12	17.91	2.16	0.91	*1.80

Notes to the table:

1. Z values above indicate statistically significant differences between the groups compared
2. *: indicates significance level at 0.05
   **: indicates significance level at 0.01
   ***: indicates significance level at 0.001

Very similar to higher to lower case, in the lower status role the Turkish subjects used a wider range of semantic formulas, but their repertoire was narrower than in the case of higher to lower, as indicated on Table 2. Both the lower status Turks and Americans used three common strategies of self-defense, apology, and offer of repair when strongly disagreeing with the boss i.e., not accepting the blame for xeroxing the wrong pages of a document. The Turks formulated two additional strategies which were criticism and acceptance.

Most of the Americans (79%) offered repair i.e., ways or alternatives to remedy what has been done, in contrast to a much smaller proportion of Turks (27%) who employed this strategy. However, both the Turks and Americans were careful to indicate that the repair will be made in a very short period of time. The Turkish statements of offer of repair ("Doğru fotokopileri hemen yaparım./I'll get the right ones immediately or "10 dakika içinde hazır olur merak etmeyin./Don't worry it will be ready in 10 minutes.) were very similar to the Americans in terms of content ("I'll make the other 20 copies of the front page instantly" or I'll make the extra copies of the front page right away.)

The frequency with which the Turks and the Americans used self-defense and apology strategies neither showed statistical difference nor exhibited much difference in terms of percentages. The Americans (58%) used self-defense strategy slightly more than Turks (48%). The American responses ("I agree that it is a waste of paper, but after all, you did ask for 30 copies of each page, not just the first one" or "We seem to have a communication gap here. I heard you say you wanted 30 copies of each page.")were very much similar to Turks in terms of content ("Ama once siz bana her sayfadan 30 fotokopi yapmamı istediniz, ben de yaptım./But first you told me to make 30 copies of each page and I did" or "O zaman doğru düzgün açıklasaydınız. Siz bir şey söylemeyince ben de bu şekilde yapılacağını düşündüm./You should have explained it better. Because you said nothing, I thought this was what was to be done.")

Both in the Turkish and the American data, apologies[1] appeared with an acceptance of an occurrence of a mistake and almost at the same very frequency The Turkish apologies ("Özür dilerim yanlış anlamışım./I am sorry I must have misunderstood" or Özür dilerim efendim sanırım yanlış anlaşılma var./I am sorry sir. There must have been a misunderstanding) sounded very similar to those of the Americans ("I am sorry I must have misunderstood what you said" or "I'm sorry I misunderstood your request.)

The strategy which was only used by Turks was criticism. The 15% of the Turks felt free to be critical of their bosses. The examples of this strategy were: "Sizin hatanız olduğu halde kızıyorsunuz. Kızmaya hakkınız yok. Bu sizin hatanız./You are angry even though this

[1] Apology formulas that occurred as part of a criticism were not analyzed as an apology because it carried the tone of a sarcasm. Examples were: Kusura bakmayın ama kızmaya hiç hakkınız yok./I an sorry, but you have no right to be angry with me" or "Özür dilerim, ama siz bana her sayfadan 30 fotokopi cekmemi istediniz./Excuse me, but you asked me to have 30 copies of each page.) 50% of the Americans and 51% of the Turks used this strategy.

is your mistake. This is your mistake" or "Bana kızamazsınız. Siz de yanlış söylediniz./You have no right to be angry. You said it wrong."

As explained before, Turks both in the higher and lower status differed from Americans in terms of the variety of range of formulas that they used when reacting to a wrongdoing of a status unequal interlocutor. Although the semantic content of the American and Turkish formulas seemed to be similar, the frequençy with which they were used varied. Furhermore, status proved to be an important factor in terms of the variety of formulas used. Despite the similarity in the semantic makeup of the formulas,the range or repertoire of status Turks' formulas was much richer and wider than the lower status Turks.

Pragmatic transfer in EFL learners' use of chastisement

In the following section, possible cases of pragmatic transfer by EFL learners, as indicated by the comparison of the frequency counts of semantic formulas used by EFL learners in the third, fourth. and sixth columns of Table I and II, will be examined.

In higher to lower status situation, instances of negative transfer as well as positive transfer and unique cases were seen. In higher to lower situation, where the TrNSs and AmEngNSs were similar in their pragmatic behavior, there was positive transfer. These were the cases where there were no statistical differences in the frequencies of L1, TL and IL were (i.e., criticism, curse, penalty and sarcasms). The semantic make-up of criticism ("It's not the work that will be done at the last moment.") did not differ much. However, it must be noted here that although statistically there were no differences across the three groups, perhaps due to the infrequent use of these four strategies, these were not used by Americans at all. The fact that these strategies did not occur in the American data, while being used by TrNSs and Turkish EFL learners are suggestive of cases of negative transfer.

The cases where negative transfer were made from the L1 were statement of error and request for repair. In these cases EFL learners used the same strategies as NSsAm.Eng, yet at a significantly different frequency to the target group. For example, Turkish EFL learners asked for repair from the lower status interlocutors at a rate paralleling those of NsTr, though at a significantly lower rate than Americans and thus transferring negatively their TL norms into the TL. Similarly, EFL learner's statement of an error was significantly different from the TL while displaying similarity to L1 norms. Advice, a strategy which was not common to Americans, were used by both TrNSs and EFL learners at a rate suggestive of negative transfer from the L1. Like TrNSs, learners said "Be careful especially while you are working. Because such mistakes only bring failure and a waste of time. Therefore you should be more careful next time."

In cases of correction, statement of despair and warning, EFL learners displayed pragmatic behavior unique to their interlanguage development. For instance, in the case of offering corrections to the lower status interlocutor, EFL learners might have been expected to transfer negatively from Turkish as the difference between Turkish and English was quite

significant, yet EFL learners' norms were significantly different from both L1 and TL norms in that they did not offer any corrections at all. In using statements of despair, they were also different from L1 norms in using this formula at a significantly lower rate than Turks, though not as infrequently as Americans. In EFL data there were instances of exclamations such as "How can you do such a stupid thing!"

In lower to higher cases, Turkish EFL learners exhibited different behavior in terms of pragmatic transfer. Although cases of positive transfer and unique interlanguage behavior were seen in the EFL data, no instances of negative transfer was found.

Positive transfer occurred in the cases of self-defense ("It's not my fault, but I'll bring you the copies of the front pages."). Criticisms ("You gave wrong instructions.") were also found in EFL data, similar to TrNS data, though these were not used by Americans at all, hence suggesting of negative transfer, though this was not statistically ascertained.

Unique IL behavior were seen in the learners' use of semantic categories such as apology, offer of repair and giving reassurance. For instance, while Turks and Americans' use of apologies were parallel in rate, Turkish EFL learners apologized to the higher status person significantly more often than both native speaker groups; ("I am very sorry indeed for the headache.) Offers of repair were more frequently given by the learners than Turks, though they were still not as frequently used as by Americans (cf. AmNSs: 78.57% > EFL:45.28% > TrNSs: 26.87%). Another strategy used only by EFL learners, albeit not that often, was reassuring the higher status person that such errors will not be repeated ("I will be more careful not to do it again.").

In sum, in their pragmatic performance in English Turkish EFL learners displayed instances of negative transfer from their L1, usually arising from the dissimilarity of their L1 and the TL. In a few cases there were positive transfer. Sometimes learners displayed pragmatic behavior unique to their IL development, which were also divergent from TL norms, though could not be traced to their L1. These findings show that instead of always depending on L1 norms in using the TL, learners sometimes create their own norms, possibly as a result of hypothesis making and testing aspects of the TL. In addition, similar to native speakers, EFL learners clearly were aware of the impact of status difference on the use of semantic strategies. Similar to native speakers of Turks, their repertoire or range of semantic strategy was more broad while chastising in higher to lower situation, whereas they employed a narrower range of semantic formulas in lower to higher status situation.

Conclusions and implications

This study investigated whether and where pragmatic transfer occurs in the productions of advanced level Turkish EFL learners by taking their reactions to occurrence of errors as a reference point. Specifically, it addressed the issue of pragmatic transfer in the execution of one speech act i.e., chastisement in status unequal situation, thus comparing advanced Turkish

EFL learners use of semantic formulas in terms of frequency with those of native speakers of L1 and the target language.

The study revealed cases of both positive and negative transfer, though the latter were more often observed, due to cross-cultural differences in the norms of the L1 and the TL. Findings also revealed that advanced level Turkish EFL learners applied strategies unique to themselves, thus creating their own sociolinguistic norms rather than relying always on their L1 norms. In other words, Turkish advanced EFL learners created an interlanguage of chastisement that was not in accordance with either L1 and L2 norms. This finding is in line with Blum-Kulka's (1993) claim that language learners develop their own interlanguage of speech act performance, which is different from both first and second language native usage.

Transferring L1 norms into the TL can be explained in relation to the perceived universality and/or language specificity of norms of speaking across languages and the lack of awareness of the pragmatic norms of the TL. Learners might be acting on the assumption that most speech behavior is universal and thus they use their L1 norms with the grammar and lexicon the LT to execute language functions. Where L1 norms are different from TL norms, they thus run the risk of being inappropriate. Especially in EFL contexts where actual contact with native speakers of the TL are limited and classroom instruction focuses of grammatical development, such behavior is not only expected but could be the only option available to learners. Though learners display the appropriate style variation in accordance with the social status of their interlocutors, possible because this is a universal phenomenon, they still display potentially unacceptable behavior by using strategies that native speakers of the TL do not find appropriate to use under the same situations.

An interesting finding, next to cases of negative and positive transfer, was the fact that EFL learners sometimes opted out of saying anything to their interlocutor, while native speakers of both L1 and the TL did say something. This can be attributed the idea that learners do not know how to deal with face-threatening speech situations, thus display silence, which is still not the norm with native speakers of the TL.

The above results show that although grammatical competence might be developed in EFL learners such that they reach advanced levels, pragmatic competence can lag behind. This finding is parallel to some other studies which report no effects of proficiency on the development of pragmatic competence (e.g., Ercetin, 1996; Linell et al. 1992; Takahashi & Beebe, 1987; Trosborg, 1987). Even after learners stop transferring their L1 grommet structures and vocabulary into the TL after gaining enough TL awareness, they can still transfer the norms of speaking from their L1 because they have not developed enough pragmatic awareness of the TL. In some cases learners develop their own norms of sociolinguistic behavior in IL which differ from both the L1 and the TL and this might be an outcome of becoming aware of differences in the use of the TL from the L1. This latter issue warrants further investigation before conclusions can be drawn as to when learners transfer from the L1 and when they form their IL norms.

The implications of our findings, along with the findings of similar studies, are that pragmatic awareness needs to be focused upon in classroom instruction as it does not seem to develop on its own in line with to grammatical development. Indeed, many scholars like Blance (1987), Holmes and Brown (1987), Olshtain and Cohen (1989), van Raffler Engle (1983), White (1993), and Wolfson (1989), have already called for an inclusion of pragmatic components into language teaching curricula. Such curricula should aim at helping learners to understand pragmatics relativity. Aided by consciousness-raising about differences in the norms of speaking across L1 and the TL and strategy training stemming from empirical research, learners can be given the opportunity to learn subtle nuances of the TL and thus act more appropriately to the latter's norms. It must be noted here that, parallel to many scholars who advocate the inclusion of pragmatic information into language programs, we are not advocating the idea of pushing learners towards acting in accordance with the norms of another culture, but rather helping them recognize the diversity in the use of language functions across cultures and equipping them with certain tools that they might use whenever they decide to do so. As Thomas (1983) says our aim is not to create replicas of English or American people but to "develop a student's metapragmatic ability - the ability to analyse language in a conscious manner"(p.98) because as Holmes an Brown (1987) indicate "unless learners pay conscious attention to the relevant social factors in a particular context, they are likely to lapse automatically into the norms of their native langage and culture and may thereby cause unintended offense." (p. 535).

The above study also shows that it is not valid to categorize learners as "advanced" by looking at their proficiency scores in grammar-oriented language tests that give no indication of the learners' pragmatic competence. Even when learners make no grammatical mistakes in a given situation, their pragmatic behavior could be quite inappropriate. This, in turn, can lead to more serious communication conflicts due to face-threatening behavior. In short, in addition to knowing the structure of the TL, it is essential to know what is appropriate to say in a particular social context and how to say it.

Similar to other studies on ILP, this study focused on the pragmatic knowledge in comprehension and production, saying nothing about the acquisition of pragmatic competence, which needs to be investigated thoroughly before we can take action about the teaching of pragmatics. Furthermore, this study examined pragmatic transfer in the "narrow sense" (Kasper & Dahl, 1991) i.e., it looked at pragmatic transfer only in the case of one particular speech act, namely chastisement, the perspective of Turkish EFL learners at advanced levels. Studies that investigate pragmatic competence on a number of speech acts as well as other aspects of pragmatics are necessary in order to develop our insights of the field of interlanguage pragmatics.

As this is a preliminary study, it dealt with pragmatic transfer in a global manner, without distinguishing between sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic transfer. Due to the nature of data collection and data analysis, however, the discussion was more pragmalinguistic in

scope, although it attempted to examine learners' judgment of sociolinguistic variation influenced by a change in social status by studying learners in interaction with status unequal interlocutors. Studies that research both sociolinguistic and pragmalinguistic transfer from more first languages than are currently available are obviously needed.

Also, American English was used to serve as baseline data in this study, as this variety is a viable target norm for Turkish learners of EFL, though the researchers acknowledge that there are different varieties of English that are governed by different norms of interaction and interpretation. All of the above limitations need to be taken into consideration in interpreting and generalizing the findings of the above study.

All in all, this study strengthens the idea that regardless of the distinctions made within the concept of pragmatic transfer, lack of the pragmatic awareness of the TL norms is a cause for miscommunication for second/foreign language users who tend to transfer some of L1 norms into their new language, in a manner quite similar to the transfer of phonemes, morphemes, lexicon, even at "advanced" levels of language development. Yet, unlike may cases of linguistic transfer, pragmatic transfer is not only more difficult to detect due to the implicit nature of rules of speaking (and the present inadequacy of empirical research that show explicitly the rules of speaking across speech communities), but it can also cause more serious damage than linguistic transfer in communication, because of its socioculturally value-laden nature. To prevent such communication failures and to aid in the development of communicative competence in a TL, we must begin to pay attention to pragmatics alongside grammar in our language instruction.

Note: The authors thank their research assistants Zeynep Koçoğlu, Zeynep Onat and Zeynep Çamlıbel for their continuous help in carrying out this research. Finally the authors thank Boğaziçi University Research Fund, without whose grant this project could not have been undertaken.

References

Atay, D. (1996). *The teaching of complex speech act behavior: The case of requests.* Unpublished Master Thesis, Bosphorus University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Beebe, L. & Cummings, M. (1985). Speech act performance: A function of data collection procedure. Paper presented at the 6th Annual TESOL and Sociolinguistics Colloquium at the International TESOL Convention, New York, USA.

Beebe, L. & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eisenstein (ed.) *The dynamic interlanguage: empirical studies in second language variation.* New York: Plenum. 199-218.

Blanche, P. (1987). The case for a pedagogy of pragmatics in foreign or second language teaching. *RELC Journal, 18,* 46-91.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "I really like your lifestyle," ESL learners learning how to compliment. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *6*(2), 31-48.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J, & Kasper, G. (eds) (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & W. S. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-29). Essex: Longman.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Clyne, M. G. (1977). Intercultural communication breakdown and communication conflict: Towards a linguistic model and exemplification. In C. Molony, H. Zobl, and W. Stoltig (Eds.), *Deutch im Kontact mit anderen sprachen* Kronberg: Scriptor verlag

_____ (1979). Communication competencies in contact. *ITL*, 43. 17-37.

_____ (1982). *Multilingual Australia: Resources, needs, policies*. Melbourne: River Seine Publications.

Cohen, A. & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of sociolinguistic competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 113-134.

Cohen, A., Olshtain, E., & Rosenstein, S. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: What remains to be learned. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *62*, 51-74.

Cohen, A. & Tarone, E. (1994). Describing and teaching speech act behavior: Starting and changing an opinion. In L. Barbara & M. Scott (Eds.), *Reflections on language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Coulmas, F. (1978). Routineformein und pragmatische Interferenzen. In W. Kühlwin & A. Raasch, eds. *Kongressberichte der 8. Jahrestaung der Gesellschaft für Angewandte Linguistic Gal e. V. Mainz 1977* (Vol. 11, 31-40) Stuttgart: Hochschulverlag.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ercetin, G. (1995). *Pragmatic transfer in the realization of apologies: The case of Turkish EFL learners,*. Unpublished MA thesis, Bosphorus University, Istanbul, Turkey.

Eisenstein, M. & Bodman, J. (1993). Expressing gratitude in American English. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 64-81). New York: Oxford University Press.

Holmes, J. & Brown, D. F. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly*, *21*(3), 523-546.

Hurley, S. D. (1992). Issues in teaching pragmatics, prosody, and nonverbal communication. *Applied Linguistics*, *13*(3), 259-281.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In B. Pride & . Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). England: Penguin.

Kasper, G. (1979a). Errors in speech act realization and the use of gambits. The Canadian Modern Language Review 35, 395-406.

_____ (1979b) Pragmatische Defizite im Englishen deutscher Lerner. *Linguistik und Didaktik* 10, 370-79.

_____ (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In Gass, S., Madden, C., Preston, D., and Selinker, L. eds. Variation in second language acquisition: discourse and pragmatics. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 37-58.

Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). Interlanguage pragmatics: An introduction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 3-18). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kasper, G. & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 215-47.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, *8*(3), 203-231.

Koike, D. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: Speech acts in interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, *73*(3), 274-289.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.

Linell, J., Lincoln, F., Stone, H. & Chen, W. (1992). Can you apologize me?: An investigation of speech act performance among non-native speakers of English. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *8*(2), 33-53.

Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1990). The learning of compex speech act behavior. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 45-65.

Rintell, E. & Mitchell, C. J. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: an inquiry into method. In Blum-Kulka et al. eds., *Cross-cultural pragmatics*, Norwood, NJ: Ables, 248-72.

Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. M. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 138-158). New York: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 91-112.

Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives and nonnatives. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *11*, 147-167.

von Raffler-Engel, W. (1983). Kinesics and pragmalinguistics: A neglected factor in second language research and training. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 36*, 225-237.

White, R. (1993). Saying please: Pragmalinguistic failure in English interaction. *ELT Journal*, *47*(3), 193-202.

Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Appendix A

Situation I (higher to lower status): You are a corporation president and you have asked your assistant to prepare Xerox copies of essential documents for an important press conference. Your assistant arrives at the last moment with 100 copies of the wrong document.

Situation II (lower to higher status): You are a middle manager in a large corporation and your boss hands you a 50-page document, asking you to make a 30 copies of each page. Ten minutes later he comes back to get the copies because it turns out he only wanted 30 copies of the front page. You have just made 10 copies of the whole packet. Obviously, he is angry with you.